





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE           | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO.  |  |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 10/020,350   | 12/12/2001            | Scott A. Arvin       | 30566.184-US-01         | 8935              |  |
| 22462 75   | 590 06/22/2004        |                      | EXAMINER                |                   |  |
|  | GATES & COOPER LLP    |                      |                         | NGUYEN, KIMBINH T |  |
| HOWARD HUGHES CENTER<br>6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050 |                       |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER      |  |
|  | LOS ANGELES, CA 90045 |                      | 2671                    | 8                 |  |
| •  |                       |                      | DATE MAILED: 06/22/2004 |                   |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| - 04  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |
|---|--|--|
| Advisory Action   | 10/020,350   | ARVIN, SCOTT A.  |
| Advisory Action   | Examiner   | Art Unit   |
|   | Kimbinh T. Nguyen  | 2671   |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ears on the cover sheet with the   | correspondence address   |
| THE REPLY FILED 14 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | void abandonment of this applica<br>) a timely filed amendment whic<br>il (with appeal fee); or (3) a time                     | ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in                                   |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | EPLY [check either a) or b)]   | ·  |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).   | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth<br>later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin<br>S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TI         | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP                              |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | of extension and the corresponding amo<br>the shortened statutory period for reply<br>ce later than three months after the mai | ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI  |  |  |
| 2. $\boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be   | ecause:  | ·  |
| (a) X they raise new issues that would require further  | er consideration and/or search (   | see NOTE below);   |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b  | pelow);  |  |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application is<br>issues for appeal; and/or  | n better form for appeal by mate   | erially reducing or simplifying the  |
| (d)  they present additional claims without cancel  | ing a corresponding number of f  | inally rejected claims.  |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.   |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject  | tion(s):   | •  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   | be allowable if submitted in a se  | eparate, timely filed amendment  |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See  |  | idered but does NOT place the  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | ause it is not directed SOLELY   | to issues which were newly   |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we   |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: None.   |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: <i>None</i> .   |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21</u> .  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  |  |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app  | roved or b) disapproved by   | the Examiner.  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme   |  |  |
| 10. Other:  |  |  |
|   | pale   | mbonds Reeger<br>not to aminer AU 26   |
|   |  |  |





Continuation of 2. NOTE: Independent claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended the features of: "accepting, from a user, placement of a user-selected 3D geometric object in a computer drawing program", whether or not the claimed features would change the scope of the invention and would require further consideration.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Arguments are not persuasive because applicants are relying on limitations in a proposed amendment that has not been entered. Further, Chen also teaches: the user informed that the 3D object 301 has been selected. The top hand of the bounding box appears to be pulling up or pushing down or both (placement), see col. 5, lines 24-60.